



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,297	09/21/2005	Raymond Andrieu	LEMAN.001APC	1931
20995	7590	01/28/2009	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			SCHILLINGER, ANN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3774	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/28/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/550,297	ANDRIEU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANN SCHILLINGER	3774	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 21-35 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 21-35 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21-23, 28, and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Moe et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0023302) in view of Angell et al. (US Pat. No. 3,983,581). Moe et al. discloses the following of the claimed invention: a biological prosthesis comprising an aortic valve (11; paragraphs 0004-0005); a tubular wall (12); and a reinforcement device (16) comprising a rod (13) implanted in the tubular outer wall. Claims 22, 23, 28, and 31-35 are disclosed as shown in Figures 1A and 1B.

Moe et al. does not teach obtaining an aortic valve from an animal. Angell et al. teaches a heart valve stent that uses porcine valves in col. 2, lines 48-59 and col. 3, lines 34-44 because the porcine valves are similar to human valves and easier to procure. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Moe et al. by using a porcine valve since they are similar to human valves and easier to procure.

Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moe et al. in view of Angell et al., further in view of Rosen (US Pat. No. 4,345,340). Moe et al., as modified by Angell et al., teaches the invention substantially as claimed, however, they do not teach the use of commissure points. Rosen teaches a heart valve with commissure points in col.

3, lines 5-15 for the purpose of securing the tubular wall to the reinforcement device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Moe et al. by using commissure points to secure the tubular wall to the reinforcement device.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moe et al. in view of Angell et al., further in view of Gupta (US Pat. No. 4,851,000). Moe et al., as modified by Angell et al., teaches the invention substantially as claimed, however, they do not teach coating the reinforcement device with a fluoropolymer material. Gupta teaches a heart valve with a fluoropolymer material coating on the reinforcement device in col. 4, lines 40-50 for the purpose of making the prosthesis more durable. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Moe et al. by using a fluoropolymer material coating on the reinforcement device in order to make the prosthesis more durable.

Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moe et al. in view of Angell et al., further in view of Pavcnik et al. (US Pub. No. 2001/0039450). Moe et al., as modified by Angell et al., teaches the invention substantially as claimed, however, they do not teach the intraparietal reinforcement devices having helical shapes. Pavcnik et al. teaches an implantable valve with an intraparietal reinforcement device that has a helical shape in Figures 2-8 and paragraphs 0008-0010 for the purpose of helping the prosthesis to better conform to the rounded contours of the vessel it is placed in. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

device of Moe et al. by giving the intraparietal reinforcement devices helical shapes in order to help the prosthesis to better conform to the rounded contours of the vessel it is placed in.

Response to Amendment

The Affidavit under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 12/29/2008 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 21-35 because: the declaration is now moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. Regarding the argument that the device of Moe et al. would fail if an animal aortic valve was used in it, implants are not chosen solely based on life expectancy as an implant lasting 1-2 yrs may serve a particular patient's needs. And as evidenced by Gupta above, coatings are known to provide enhanced durability. Furthermore, the evidence of the declaration is based on opinion and appears to suggest the device would not work well rather than not work at all.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANN SCHILLINGER whose telephone number is (571)272-6652. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. 9 a.m. to 4 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Isabella can be reached on (571) 272-4749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 3774

/William H. Matthews/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3774

